(b)(3)
(b)(6)

Honorable Joseph A. Califano, Jr.
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Mr. Califano,

The Central Intelligence Agency has a duty to find and notify persons who were the subjects of Agency sponsored drug experimentation many years ago without their knowledge where it can be reasonably determined that their health may still be adversely affected. I solicit your cooperation and assistance in this very difficult undertaking.

For your background information, the former CIA officer who was chiefly responsible for the drug research program destroyed, just before his retirement, what he believed to be all of the records pertaining to the program. About a year ago during a search through our Archives in response to a request under the Freedom of Information Act, several boxes of records related to the drug program were discovered. These records, however, reveal very little of the operational and substantive detail about how the actual experiments were conducted. We

64

RELEASED July 2000

do know that virtually all of the research was done at private institutions by professional people who were in the direct or consultative employ of those institutions. The CIA role was to provide funds in support of the research through research foundations without attribution to CIA. In some cases the individual researchers and institutions were aware that CIA was an ultimate source of funding, and in some cases they were not. It was considered necessary at the time to protect against disclosure the fact that CIA was interested in the research and supported it with funds.

The institutions that were involved, whether knowledgable of CIA interest or not, have been informed of the CIA role in supplying funds and the mechanisms through which funding was accomplished. Copies of records we have pertaining to individual institutions have been furnished to those institutions that requested them. None of the records available, however, contain the identities of individuals who may have been the subjects of drug experimentation.

As I see it, there are four basic elements of the problem. One element is to determine which among the drugs used had a potential for causing harmful long term aftereffects. A second element is to establish whether CIA or the institution that conducted the

experiments has the primary responsibility for putting the subjects into whatever danger may have attended the tests. A third element is to determine whether subjects who volunteered to participate in the experiments were sufficiently informed of the potential consequences. Finally, we have to identify, find and notify the affected subjects. These intrinsically difficult tasks are complicated further by legal constraints on the process by which subjects are identified, located and notified.

None of the elements of the problem lends itself to direct solution through information currently available. We will have to go to the institutions involved and, in some cases, to the individual researchers, in search of supplementary data. We are advised by the Attorney General that the institutions may be precluded from divulging the identity of the subjects to the CIA by federal statute, federal agency regulations, or the doctor-patient privilege. Further, even if the institutions could legally cooperate, they may decline to do so out of concern that their cooperation in notification could lead to litigation and potential liability on their part for the role they played.

To the extent that we may be successful in identifying any of the subjects we will have the subsequent problem of locating them. Here, again, the law and concern for the privacy of the individuals pose restrictions. Open or public association with the

CIA in the context of the reason for a current contact could cause the individuals embarassment and reputational discredit. This means the location process will have to be done without interview of associates, neighbors, or local officials; but through records. Again, there may be legal prohibitions against the use of the records of private as well as government institutions.

When it comes to the notification of any subjects that may be found, we are informed that CIA has no legal authority to offer indemnification. We may be limited to providing a simple notice and an offer to furnish whatever information we have to the subject's physician.

We have established that there were fifteen activities involving other government or private institutions where human subjects clearly were involved (10), or where there is some reason to believe that humans might have been subjects of research involving the administration of drugs (5). In nine of the ten activities that clearly involved human testing the subjects were volunteers, many of whom were paid for taking part, but we do not know how well they may have been informed about the potential consequences of their participation. Two of those that used witting subjects also used subjects who were unaware that they were a part of the research.

Our next step is to seek further information from the

institutions and researchers who were involved. We need to try to determine whether the involvement of CIA was so direct and controlling as to establish its responsibility for the activities as they were carried out. In cases where the responsibility rests with CIA we will then have to seek to identify, locate, and notify subjects. In the process, of course, we will have to try to identify the drugs and get an evaluation of their potential for causing long term after-effects from which the subjects might still be suffering harm. It is these steps that lead me to solicit your cooperation and assistance. The professional congruity your department would represent to the institutions involved should make it possible for you to be a more effective agent of the Government than CIA could expect to be.

If you feel it might be possible for your department to assist us in this matter I would be pleased to discuss it with you further to explore how we might most effectively join forces to achieve the desired end.

Sincerely,

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: MKULTRA Subprojects 23, 45, and 141

1. Subprojects 23, 45, and 141 supported research conducted by Dr. Charles Geschickter at [redacted] The research was concerned with chemical agents effective in modifying the behavior and function of the central nervous system in animals. A memorandum for the record dated 25 August 1955 says the project engineer authorized the contractor (Geschickter) to pay the hospital expenses of certain persons suffering from incurable cancer for the privilege of studying the effects of certain chemicals during their terminal illnesses. The memorandum says that "the total funds expended in this fashion amounted to $658.05 and full value was received."

2. Subproject 45 began, apparently, in 1955 as a study of certain biochemical compounds and their effects on guinea pigs and rabbits. In 1956-57 study turned to various causes of coma. The program for 1957-58 involved continuation of the study of comatose conditions, a study of glucose metabolic blocking agents, and stress phenomena. Human patients were used. The 1958-59 research was devoted to an analysis of the neural and endocrine mechanism of stress and the chemical agents that influence it. Human patients were used. The same

general lines of inquiry continued in subsequent years until termination of the project in 1963.

3. Nothing in the file suggests what subproject 141 might have been.

4. Dr. Geschickter appeared before the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research of the Committee on Human Resources of the Senate in September 1977. During his testimony he was questioned specifically about subproject 23 and the payment of hospital expenses for terminally ill cancer patients. The inquiry focussed on the entry in the financial record which Dr. Geschickter said was incorrect. He did not specifically deny that drugs were administered to cancer patients, but his response distinguished between experimentation on laboratory animals and the payment of expenses for cancer patients. The implication, apparently accepted by the Committee, was that experimental drugs were not administered to cancer patients.

5. Senator Kennedy also questioned Dr. Geschickter about subproject 45. Dr. Geschickter's responses apparently satisfied the committee that durgs administered to cancer patients were a part of legitimate cancer treatment research. He said "we were not giving our patients stress drugs."

6. Inasmuch as Dr. Geschickter's testimony denies administration of potentially harmful drugs to unwitting patients and the

Senate seems satisfied with that testimony, there appears to be no need for the Agency to pursue the inquiry further.

[redacted]

(b)(6)

[redacted]
University of Oklahoma
900 Asp Avenue, Room 237
Norman, Oklahoma 73019

Dear Mr. [redacted]

We are grateful for your cooperation and the helpful responses from you and [redacted] to our correspondence last year about the MKULTRA program as it related to the University of Oklahoma. We now find it necessary to solicit your cooperation and assistance with respect to this program once again.

We have received from the Attorney General of the United States an opinion which determines that the Central Intelligence Agency, on behalf of the United States Government, has a duty to notify persons who were the subjects of drug experimentation under the (CAPS) Mkultra program, if it can be reasonably established that:

(a) the subjects may still be suffering harmful long term aftereffects,

(b) the drugs were administered without the knowledge of the subjects, and

(c) the experiments were conducted under direction and control of CIA sufficient to establish CIA liability for any consequences that may have befallen the subjects.

If there is any doubt about the actual notice of participation given to volunteer subjects, or the particular testing they underwent, those subjects also should be notified.

We have found in many cases that CIA was interested in the results of research initiated and sponsored by other organizations and conducted entirely in accordance with professional and ethical standards applicable to the particular circumstances at the time. We have found no evidence anywhere that CIA exerted undue influence or attempted in any way to coerce individuals or institutions to undertake research that they might not otherwise have undertaken nor did the Agency attempt to cause any compromise of professional and ethical standards under which the research was conducted. Insofar as we are able to tell from our records, none of the research conducted by private institutions was clandestine in any way; studies were carried out openly and the results in many cases were published. We assume that work done at the University of Oklahoma fits these general descriptors or the University would not have become involved.

Unfortunately, however, our surviving records are far from complete and we cannot in all cases state with absolute assurance what the facts are. We must solicit the cooperation and assistance of institutions that were involved to clarify the facts in order that informed judgments can be made about the true nature of the CIA obligation. This letter is addressed to you in that spirit.

As you will see from copies of documents relevant to MKULTRA subproject 43 furnished to [redacted] by letter from Mr. Cinquegrana September 22, 1977, there is an implication that drugs were used on human subjects in conjunction with experiments involving hypnotizability and suggestibility. There are a number of unknowns that we would like to ask you to address. We cannot tell from our records whether experiments using drugs were in fact conducted; nor can we tell, if such experiments were conducted, what drugs were used, whether they could have caused long term aftereffects from which the subjects might still be suffering, or whether the subjects were sufficiently well informed to have given their informed consent. Finally, our records contain no evidence that CIA exerted any direct influence over the form or content of the research. Recognizing that the statutory prohibition against our furnishing you the identity of the person(s) who conducted the research may pose an insurmountable impediment to your finding the answers to these unknowns, we must nevertheless ask that you address them as the first step toward assisting us in the discharge of the Agency's obligation.

At the same time, however, we must acknowledge that you are under no obligation to respond. Indeed, it may be that you are precluded from responding by the laws of the State of Oklahoma, rules of the University, or other regulations that may apply to your circumstances. The laws of privacy must, of course, be observed in any response you may feel inclined to give.

Your assistance in this matter will be appreciated.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: MKULTRA Subproject 46

1. There is no evidence in the file that testing on human subjects was a part of subproject 46. The attachment to a memorandum for the record dated 15 December 1955 in paragraph one says "The overall plan will be to incorporate into the molecule suitable atoms to serve as tags and to administer it to experimental-animals in whose tissues the tagged atoms can be identified after various time periods." (emphasis added) Paragraph five of the same attachment says: "The problem is to discover what the body does with LSD. The percentages of a dose of LSD retained in many other organs and tissues of the body will be measured. The pattern of excretion is important. Information as to what chemical alterations are induced by the metabolic activity of cells in the central nervous system or in the liver or in the muscle will be sought. Because of the ability of this molecule to produce schizophrenic-like disorganization in normal humans, the concentration of LSD in the central nervous system will of course have a prime interest. One task will be to discover whether concentration differences exist in various parts of the central nervous system."

2. The mere mention of humans in this quotation is not a

sufficient reason to conclude that humans were used as test subjects. In the total context of the proposal it is at least equally as reasonable to conclude that known effects of the drug on humans give added significance to the tests on animals. Because the statement of the overall plan in paragraph one orients the research directly to experimental animals it seems reasonable to infer that paragraph five might have been more precisely stated as follows: "The problem is to discover what the body does with LSD. The percentages of a dose of LSD retained in many other organs and tissues of the animal body will be measured. The pattern of excretion is important. Information as to what chemical alterations are induced in the animal by the metabolic activity of cells in the central nervous system or in the liver or in the muscle will be sought. Because of the ability of this molecule to produce schizophrenic-like disorganization in normal humans, the concentration of LSD in the central nervous system of animals will of course have a prime interest. One task will be to discover whether concentration differences exist in various parts of the central nervous systems of laboratory animals." While these insertions may tend to over-emphasize the interpretation that animals rather than humans were the subjects of the tests, any one of them would have been sufficient to support specifically the overall plan stated in paragraph one. The original author of the plan clearly had no foresight that 20 years after his writing a question would be raised by zealously cautious and suspicious researchers.

3. [redacted] held a Top Secret Agency clearance and was aware of CIA interest. [redacted] apparently was not. A memorandum for the record dated 22 August 1958 says in paragraph eight, "[redacted] has been cleared for Top Secret by the Agency and is the only witting individual at [redacted]" The research was supported by the Lilly Company, [redacted] The Public Health Service, and the [redacted] as well as CIA through the Geschickter Fund. The project was considerd unclassified after it left the Geschickter Fund.

4. 4. There is nothing in the file to suggest that CIA exerted any more influence over the direction of the research, its substance, or the manner in which it was conducted than any of the other supporters. The University knew of the project and supported it but did not know that CIA was interested. The University, therefore, as well as the other supporters, had a much more direct influence over it than CIA.

5. Because there is no clear evidence that human testing was involved, and because other organizations were more directly responsible for the research than was CIA, no further action will be taken with respect to MKULTRA subproject 46.

[redacted]

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: MKULTRA Sybproject 125

1. Subproject 125 provided CIA funding support through the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology for a study conducted by the Veterans Administration at the V.A. facility in Martinsburg, West Virginia. The study was also supported by the Public Health Service, the National Institutes of Health and, of course, the Veterans Administration. Results of the studies were published in professional journals, and the studies were described in annual reports of the Human Ecology fund for 1961 and 1961-1963.

2. The Veterans Administration was interested in psychological problems related to aging, long-term institutionalization and long-term illness, and the analysis of drug effects on performance and mood. The subjects were male "domiciliary members who were psychiatrically and physically able to participate in the experiment, as determined by the responsible medical personnel at the Center. Each (subject) was a volunteer and was tested individually." Eighty subjects ranging in age from 60 to 81 years were randomly assigned to one of four groups; (1) those given 10 mg of d-amphetamine followed by orange juice; (2) those given 10 mg of sodium bicarbonate in a capsule followed by orange juice; (3) those given 10 mg of d-amphetamine disguised (dissolved) in orange juice, and (4) orange juice alone. In other studies, a conclusion was drawn that single doses of meprobamate (400 mg), d-amphetamine (5 mg) and a placebo had little or no effect on problem solving abilities.

3. The nature of the drugs used (meprobamate and d-amphetamine) in the dosages administered under the controlled conditions of the research render it virtually certain that no long-term harmful aftereffects would have been produced. The subjects were witting volunteers and the research was under the direction and control of professional medical personnel of the Veterans Administration. The youngest of the surviving volunteers would now be 79 years of age. Under the circumstances, there is no need to pursue this case further.

[redacted]